DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 016 24 EA 004 264

AUTHOR	Miklos, Erwin
TITLE	Training-in-Common for Educational, Public, and Business Administrators. ERIC/CEM-UCEA Series on Administrator Preparation. ERIC/CEM State-of-the-Knowledge Series, Number Seventeen. UCEA Monograph Series, Number Four.
INSTITUTION	Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.; University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0353
PUB DATE	72
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080353-3514
NOTE	62p.
AVAILABLE FROM	University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210. ($2.00, Quantity Discounts)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; *Educational Administration; Educational Methods; Educational Programs; Education Courses; Instructional Innovation; *Integrated Activities; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Management Education; *Professional Training; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Training in Common

ABSTRACT

In this monograph, the author assesses the progress that has been made toward the development of in-common programs for preparing administrators to serve in a variety of institutional settings. After outlining the assumptions, rationales, and strategies behind attempts to institute interdisciplinary administrator training programs, the author describes in detail several Canadian and American programs that provide such training. Although some of the programs described consist only of shared classes and seminars, others entail a completely integrated program of experiences. The author describes several sources of resistance to the adoption of training-in-common and shows how these resistive forces must be overcome if the implementation of in-common training programs is to be accelerated. An extensive bibliography is included. (Author/DN)

ED 069016

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Training-in-Common for Educational, Public, and Business Administrators

Erwin Miklos

1972

EA 004 264

Commissioned by
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Educational Management

Published by
University Council for
Educational Administration

ERIC/CEM–UCEA SERIES ON ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION

Under the editorship of

PHILIP K. PIELE, Director

ERIC Clearinghouse
on Educational Management
University of Oregon

and

JACK CULBERTSON, Executive Director

University Council
for Educational Administration
The Ohio State University

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management operates under contract with the Office of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This publication was prepared pursuant to that contract. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 72-86749
ERIC/CEM Accession Number: EA 004 264

ERIC/CEM State-of-the-Knowledge Series, Number Seventeen
UCEA Monograph Series, Number Four

Manuscript edited by Stuart C. Smith

Printed in the United States of America
Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.
19 North Jackson
Danville, Illinois 61832

TITLES IN THIS SERIES

1. **Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature,** by Robin H. Farquhar and Philip K. Piele

2. **Unconventional Methods and Materials for Preparing Educational Administrators,** by Richard Wynn

3. **Emergent Practices in the Continuing Education of School Administrators,** by Frank W. Lutz and Reynolds Ferrante

4. **Training-in-Common for Educational, Business, and Public Administrators,** by Erwin Miklos

5. **New Approaches to Recruitment and Selection of Educational Administrators,** by Robert T. Stout

6. **The Preparation of School Administrators in Quantitative Analysis,** by James E. Bruno

7. **The Use of Computers in Administrator Preparation,** by E. Wailand Bessent and Philip K. Piele

8. **Innovative Strategies in Field Experiences for Preparing Administrators,** by Peter P. Horoschak and Joseph M. Cronin

Copies, at $2.00 each, can be purchased from the University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Quantity discounts as follows: 2 to 24 copies, $1.80 each; 25 or more copies, $1.60 each.

ERIC/CEM

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the United States Office of Education. ERIC serves the educational community by disseminating educational research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of eighteen such units in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its seventeen companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Research in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for $21 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Most of the documents listed in *RIE* can be purchased through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, operated by Leasco Information Products, Inc.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education. CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $39 a year from CCM Information Corporation, 866 Third Avenue, Room 1126, New York, New York 10022. Annual and semiannual cumulations can be ordered separately.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse has another major function—information analysis and synthesis. The Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, state-of-the-knowledgepapers, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its area.

UCEA

The mission of the University Council for Educational Administration is to improve the preparation of administrative personnel in education. Its membership consists of major universities in the United States and Canada. UCEA's central staff works with and through scholars in member universities to create new standards and practices in administrator preparation and to disseminate the results to interested institutions.

UCEA's interest in the professional preparation of educational administrators includes both continuing education and resident, preservice programs. Interinstitutional cooperation and communication are basic tools used in development activities; both administrators and professors participate in projects.

The Council's efforts currently are divided into six areas: developing and testing strategies for improving administrative and leadership practices in school systems; encouraging an effective flow of leaders into preparatory programs and posts of educational administration; advancing research and its dissemination; providing information and ideas helpful to those in universities responsible for designing preparatory programs; integrating and improving preparatory programs in specific areas of administration; and developing and evaluating the Monroe City URBSIM simulation and support materials.

Contents

FOREWORD vii

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. RATIONALES AND STRATEGIES 5
   - Rationales 5
   - Strategies 14

3. PRESENT PRACTICES 20
   - General Management and Combined Programs 20
   - Integrated Programs 26
   - Comparisons 36

4. PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS 38
   - Problems 39
   - Prospects 46

5. SUMMARY 48

BIBLIOGRAPHY 51

Foreword

During the last decade, programs to prepare educational administrators have undergone considerable change. Growing specialization in the field of educational administration resulting from new knowledge production (for example, operations research) is one reason for the program change. Another is the continuing search for more effective patterns of field experience, instructional method, and content in preparatory programs.

Because of the varied changes achieved in preparation in different universities, those interested in designing or updating programs today are faced with a greater number of options than was the case ten years ago. A major purpose of this monograph series is to shed light on the various options now available to those interested in administrator preparation. A second purpose is to advance general understanding of developments in preparation during the past decade. The series is directed to professors, students, and administrators interested in acquiring information on various aspects of preparation.

Each author in the series has been asked to define the parameters of his subject, review and analyze recent pertinent literature and research, describe promising new practices emerging in actual training programs across the country, and identify knowledge gaps and project future developments. The papers in the series were planned and developed cooperatively by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management and the University Council for Educational Administration. The editors of the series hope that the monographs will prove valuable to those interested in understanding and assessing recent and projected developments in preparation.

In this monograph, the fourth in the series, Erwin Miklos assesses progress that has been made toward the development of in-common programs for preparing administrators to serve in a variety of institutional settings. After presenting the assumptions and rationales for training-in-common, Dr. Miklos describes in detail several programs incorporating various aspects of the in-common approach. Finding that training-in-common has been only sparsely implemented, he describes several sources of resistance to its adoption and shows how these must be overcome if its implementation is to be accelerated.

Dr. Miklos is a professor of educational administration at the University of Alberta. Before joining the university's staff in 1962, he accumulated a total of eleven years' experience as a classroom teacher and principal. He received two bachelor's degrees with honors in 1954 from the University of Saskatchewan and his master's and doctor's degrees in 1960 and 1963 from the University of Alberta.

Specializing in organization theory, Dr. Miklos has conducted several research projects and authored numerous publications. He recently prepared a position paper for the Commission on Educational Planning entitled "Organization and Administration of Educational Systems: Internal Structures and Processes." He also serves as editor of *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research.*

PHILIP K. PIELE
JACK CULBERTSON

1

Introduction

In recent decades scholars in various specialized fields of administration have made frequent references to commonalities in administrative processes and practices in different organizations. The debate whether administration in various types of organizations is substantially the same or significantly different has gradually been resolved to the generally accepted position that administrative processes have both common and unique characteristics.

Despite this agreement, an analysis of current emphases in preparation programs and in the study of administration reveals an almost universal practice of stressing that which is unique to the neglect of that which is common. The question that follows directly from such an analysis is why the common or generic aspects of administration are ignored. Why is administration not studied as a generic process, as administration qua administration, before scholars and researchers concentrate on the peculiarities of the specialized areas? There is no ready answer to these questions.

These and related questions were given considerable attention

during the fifties and sixties when the study of educational administration underwent intensive reexamination. For a time it appeared educational administration scholars were in the forefront among proponents of generic study. Walton (1959 and 1962) proposed that at one level of abstraction administration was basically the same in all organizations. Griffiths (1959) deplored the extension of specialized emphasis to areas within educational administration. Boyan summarized the situation:

> The more that professors of school administration looked to the social sciences for help in understanding administrative behavior, the more the processes of administering schools appeared to be like the processes of administering other organizations. The skills applicable to understanding, predicting, and controlling human behavior appeared to hold with generality in administering organizations of all kinds. (1963, p. 11)

Boyan also noted that, along with other developments of the times,

> . . . the notion of administration *qua* administration took hold in a powerful way with the more imaginative students of school administration. (p. 12)

To some it seemed the study of educational administration might be placed more appropriately within the field of administration than within the field of education. Further, if generalizations applicable to administration in all organizations could be developed, then training-in-common would be a logical preparation strategy.

The major purpose of this monograph is to review some of the more recent developments in thought and practice regarding in-common approaches to study and training in administration. These developments in the study of administration as a general process are viewed primarily from an educational administration perspective. Although there are numerous issues, this report attempts to focus on study and training in-common without becoming sidetracked by peripheral considerations about the preparation of administrators and developments in educational administration.

The initial foray into the literature revealed numerous tangential references but surprisingly few that were directly relevant. Recognizing that practice may be ahead of writing, the plan for this monograph included descriptions of current practices. Accordingly, with the assistance of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), information was sought from various institutions having some visible form of common approach to the study

of administration. This search for information revealed numerous interested institutions and individuals, but, with a few notable exceptions, yielded little or no information about ongoing in-common approaches to preparing administrators or studying administration. Consequently, a decision was made to describe only a limited number of programs representing significant formalized attempts to develop training-in-common and to exclude those representing more informal or casual types of contact among the various administration specialties.

The fact that no extensive effort was made to survey these less formalized programs places limitations on this report. Not only is the importance of these practices ignored, but the possibility of overlooking some significant developments is increased. Another limitation to a comprehensive description of these practices results from reliance on information in brochures, mimeographed reports intended for within-institution use, catalogs, and related materials. Furthermore, preparation programs—particularly new programs—are modified in the light of experience and, by the time they are described in a report, may have undergone major change.

Use of the present tense in describing programs indicates these practices exist at the time of writing; they may have changed greatly by the time the monograph is read.

In the initial formulation of this topic, it was assumed the major concern would be with programs that attempt to provide some type of in-common, integrated, or undifferentiated program for preparing administrators to work in various institutional areas: education, government, business, health services, and others. Soon it became evident that adoption of such a specific delimitation would prove far too narrow for a useful analysis. As a result, *training-in-common* is defined to include all formalized arrangements for bringing together prospective administrators or researchers from two or more institutional areas for some form of common learning experience during at least part of their training programs. This more inclusive definition covers activities and experiences ranging from a common course or seminar to a completely integrated program of experiences. It is hoped this approach will provide a more realistic view of the alternatives available to designers of preparation programs than would a narrower definition of the subject.

The following chapter summarizes and synthesizes the assumptions, rationales, and strategies for emphasizing common aspects of

administration as proposed in the literature. The third chapter describes some Canadian and American programs identified as giving attention to commonalities in administration. The fourth chapter analyzes the current state of development and provides some suggestions for an intensive exploration of the potential of training-in-common.

2

Rationales and Strategies

All proposals for an increased emphasis on common, or generic, aspects in the study of administration are premised on a limited number of assumptions. The first is that there are indeed similarities of sufficient significance among the administrative processes in different organizations to warrant a generalized approach to the preparation of researchers, students of administration, and practitioners. A second assumption is that some body of content, a core, that will serve the needs of administrators in all fields, can be identified and developed. That is, training-in-common is assumed to be feasible given the present state of knowledge. On these two basic assumptions rest both the rationales for in-common approaches and the various strategies that have been proposed or attempted.

RATIONALES

Advocates of an increased emphasis on commonalities base their arguments on desirability as well as feasibility. Since these

arguments from the general rationale for training-in-common, they need to be critically analyzed.

For the purposes of this analysis, the numerous specific arguments have been collapsed and combined into six major categories. The generic study of administration and training-in-common are proposed as vehicles for (1) upgrading training programs (2) developing the science of administration, (3) improving interrelationships among organizations, (4) recognizing the convergence of organization characteristics, (5) offering broadened career preparation, and (6) effecting economies in preparation programs.

UPGRADING TRAINING PROGRAMS

Given the many changes taking place in various fields of study, it is not difficult to see inadequacies and deficiencies in almost any professional preparation program. Snyder (1969) has noted, for example, that the many societal changes that are placing new demands on administrators require new types of training programs. The search for an improved training strategy sometimes leads to the suggestion that possibilities for upgrading may exist through cooperation among the specialized fields of administration. When Hinderaker (1963) viewed the field, he concluded there were possibilities for mutual upgrading through closer cooperation among public, business, and educational administration. In his opinion, such cooperation (or integration) would lead to improvements because the fields were at different stages of development. Consequently, they could learn and borrow from one another.

According to Hinderaker, the differences in stages of development have been caused by the histories of the specialties, their traditional location within the university, and the extent of their association with the basic behavioral science and quantitative disciplines. Educational administration appeared to have the most to gain from, and business administration the most to offer to, the general study of administration. Public administration, as Hinderaker saw it, fell somewhere between the two.

Even though business administration may be the most advanced of the three disciplines and have the most to offer, it also has some shortcomings that could be ameliorated through collaboration with the other two specialties. Critics still find much to be desired in actual practice in business preparation programs. Among the charges

levelled at the traditional business school are that it is too narrow in perspective, too functionally oriented, and too vocational (Wegner 1970a). In-common preparation programs are seen to be a way to force the business school out of the narrow channel it has carved for itself.

Students of public administration such as Hilling (1966), Short (1966), Riggs (1968), and Charlesworth (1968), among others, are convinced of its independence as a field of study and practice. However, public administration continues to search for its identity and for a "home" among fields of study and professional schools.

A continuing debate concerns where the study of public administration should be placed. The problems created by its current association with political science have been summarized well by Yoon (1968). Many analysts believe the development of public administration has been hindered by this association. Waldo puts it strongly when he says:

> . . . my concern is that preparation for public administration is hampered and depressed and, in some cases, killed and suppressed in departments of political science. I propose that, where feasible, it be given freedom from such departments. (Waldo 1968)

The shortcomings such critics as Yoon and Waldo see in public administration's affiliation with political science are readily summarized: narrowness of focus, academic as opposed to professional orientation, and exclusion of relevant content from other disciplines. The new environment for public administration might well be an in-common program for administrators in all specialties.

Despite the ambitious efforts to upgrade itself (and the significant progress already made), some still feel the study of educational administration is too closely allied to education. In present programs greater attention is given to analysis of teaching-learning issues and preparation problems than to major administrative issues. Furthermore, the location of programs of study in schools of education militates against the incorporation of important contributions from basic disciplines and from related fields. Consequently, the development of educational administration lags behind and, like public administration, requires a new environment.

Still another group of administrative specialties would benefit from an in-common approach—those that have not yet developed to the same extent as business, public, and educational adminis-

tration. These specialties include administration in many areas of social service: public health care, recreation, community development, and others. Training-in-common might serve as the basis for developing high quality programs without extensive periods of particularized and isolated development.

DEVELOPING THE SCIENCE OF ADMINISTRATION

The objective of improving preparation programs is closely related to the desire to develop the science of administration or the discipline of administrative studies. Proponents of common programs and most students of administration agree there are sufficient commonalities among administrative processes in different organizations to make pursuing the development of such a discipline worthwhile. Critics of existing programs for the study of administration point out that these approaches leave the field so fragmented that the development of concepts and theories is seriously impaired. Some years ago Litchfield stated his view of the situation very clearly:

> . . . the most serious indictment which must be made of present thought is that it has failed to achieve a level of generalization enabling it to systematize and explain administrative phenomena which occur in related fields. Indeed, so far are we from broad generalizations about administration that we appear to maintain that there is not a generic administrative process but only a series of isolated types of administration. We seem to be saying that there is business administration and hospital administration and public administration; that there is military administration, hotel administration, and school administration. But there is no administration. We buttress this conclusion and make general theory more difficult of attainment by developing separate schools in these fields in our universities. (1956, p. 7)

Litchfield goes on to point out that practice is far ahead of thought in recognizing the common elements of administration: practitioners move from one type of organization to another and consulting firms apparently are able to apply the same concepts to diverse types of organizations. Such practices indicate the existence of generalizations applicable to administration regardless of the particulars of its setting.

Parsons raised a similar criticism concerning the fragmented study of organizations: different types of organizations are studied by different academic disciplines. For example, business organizations

are likely to be studied by economists and governmental organizations by political scientists. He commented:

> This tendency to divide the field obscures both the importance of the common elements, and the systematic bases of variation from one type to another. (1965, p. 238)

The undesirable consequences of fragmenting the field of organizational studies are also seen in the study of administrative processes within those organizations: common elements are overlooked and variations are not understood. Although in recent years considerable progress has been made in unifying and interrelating organizational studies, far less progress is evident in the study of administration.

Among others, Thompson has affirmed that there "is now every reason to believe that an administrative science can be built, although the building will not be easy" (1956, p. 102). More recently, Snyder (1969) indicated that, in his opinion, developments in basic disciplines have reached a point where the necessary collection, collation, and synthesis of content relevant to administrative studies can be initiated. This eclectic approach to the development of the science of administration will require a continuing extended involvement of interdisciplinary teams of scholars. A center for the study of administration, or school of administrative studies, appears to be the most suitable strategy for bringing together scholars from various disciplines and institutional arenas, and for providing an environment for accelerating the development of the discipline.

Thompson emphasizes the importance of systematic collaboration:

> The development of an administrative science will be hobbled until we can find concepts applicable to a variety of administrative levels so that, for example, scientific knowledge of phenomena at supervisory levels can feed into understanding of events at higher levels, and vice versa, or until we develop concepts which will permit confirmation in, say, the hospital setting, of relationships observed in a business or military organization. (1956, p. 106)

Such developments are more likely to take place if organizational arrangements exist to facilitate rather than impede the systematic study and research Thompson sees as essential.

Culbertson indicates that developing the science of administration involves a formidable challenge. Nevertheless, he states:

> . . . if efforts cannot be consciously directed and focused upon clear

> targets, administrative study is likely to be diffuse, desultory, and the results scattered and even hidden in a variety of specialized endeavors. (1965, p. 12)

These consequences of failing to meet the challenge should stimulate serious scholars to work at overcoming existing barriers and boundaries.

IMPROVING ORGANIZATIONAL INTERRELATIONSHIPS

The need for some common experiences during administrator preparation programs is accentuated by the growing organizational interdependence that cuts across institutional boundaries. With increasing frequency, administrators in one type of organization are forced to communicate with those in other types. Waldo observed "the development of a network of relationships between government and private enterprise of such scope, depth, and complexity as to make the delineation in some areas of any clear line between public and private impossible" (1968, p. 21).

Similar networks of relationships are being woven among educational, business, and various public agencies as a result of the complex environmental and organizational problems of the times. An organization attempting to cope with urgent social or economic problems finds that organizations in other institutional arenas also have been grappling with the same problems. The discharge of functions in one area requires cooperation with—and even enlistment of—organizations in another.

Concern has been expressed that existing approaches to the preparation of administrators hinder the development of effective communication among organizations. Snyder (1969) proposes that the basis for such communication must be developed during the preparation program through provision of common or parallel experiences. In his view, the common elements and comparative aspects should be pursued in the preparation program until a stage is reached where divergent experiences are required by different roles in particular types of organizations.

Such arguments are highly persuasive. It seems reasonable to suggest that administrators in one area should become familiar with similarities and differences in the values, constraints, and conditions that exist in others. Not only might communication be improved, but prospective administrators might also obtain a better perspec-

tive on the values and biases that are part of the culture of their particular organization.

CONVERGING ORGANIZATION CHARACTERISTICS

There appears to be growing justification for the assumption that important similarities exist among different types of organizations. Some observers have noted a convergence in the characteristics of organizations, particularly large-scale organizations. Similarities between public and private organizations have been most frequently observed. For example, Crozier stated:

> Whether public or private, modern large-scale organizations . . . are made up . . . of complex sets of individuals and groups which maintain relatively independent power and influence relationships with each other in regard to goals officially aimed at. (1968, p. 8)

These similarities tend to reduce the significance of differences between the administration of public and private enterprises, at least as far as internal operations are concerned. Crozier suggests that changing environmental and operational conditions create convergence and that "the role of the administrator in the public sector now seems much nearer to that of managers in the private sector" (p. 8). It seems reasonable to extend the observation by suggesting that some differences are also diminishing between various subcategories within the public and private domains.

Wengert has made a similar observation about the public role and the political involvement of business organizations:

> . . . every large-scale enterprise plays a *public* role and is part of the basic political processes of our society, whether we call it a business organization, a labor union or a governmental body. (1961, p. 13)
>
> Increasingly, like the public administrator, the administrator of the large scale business enterprise also participates in politics. He makes his appeal not only in the course of governmental elections, but in many other activities through which the undifferentiated publics of our economic life cast their "votes." (p. 16)

Convergence in organizational characteristics and similarities in the administrative function in the two major areas long assumed to differ greatly—public and private—call into question the maintenance of sharply defined boundaries in the study of administration and the development of preparation programs.

Recent trends in educational administration might be interpreted as further indications of convergence. Increasingly, education has

come to be viewed as an instrument of social policy, as a vehicle for the achievement of various social goals. Consequently, it has been forced to work closely with organizations concerned with the provision of other social services and as a result has adopted some of their strategies. Similarly, the distinction between educational and profit-making organizations has diminished as educational administrators have faced demands for efficiency, accountability, and cost-effectiveness. Culbertson notes visible signs of the erosion of differences between public and private sectors:

> While educational leaders have been adopting the language of the business firm, those in large corporations have been using terms traditionally associated with the public sector. (1969, p. 75)

These trends place educational administration in the stream of convergence taking place between public and private administration.

OFFERING BROADENED CAREER PREPARATION

Convergence of organizational characteristics and the consequent similarities in administrative processes indicate there should also be similarities in the skills, abilities, and knowledge possessed by administrators. The changing environmental and organizational characteristics likewise indicate that requisite skills and abilities for the future should be radically different from those of the past. For example, administrators must be prepared to work with changing organizational structures, rapidly changing environments, and adhocracies rather than bureaucracies. In addition, more and more administrators will probably find themselves moving from one institutional area to another. Realistic preparation should take cognizance of these trends and broaden the immediate range of career alternatives by developing appropriate programs.

The difficulty of defining desirable skills for an administrator is increased by the changing organizational and environmental characteristics. Snyder proposes that an administrator should be a generalist-specialist possessing the following attributes:

> . . . we have defined a generalist as one who has two basic attributes: first, he possesses a generalizable substantive knowledge relevant to a certain range of phenomena of social behavior. Second he has a mixture of capabilities which are not time-, place-, or technologically bound—in other words, a repertoire of things which he can do, say, and think with respect to the fulfilment of responsibilities connected

> with his role and position. . . . Specialized learning is that which comes from cumulative exposure to recurrent features of clearly bounded situations and roles. (1969, p. 280)

Snyder's general image of the administrator poses a challenge to those responsible for designing new preparation programs:

> What we are groping toward is a combination philosopher, scientist, and organizational theorist who can rise above the perceptual limitations and conflicts inherent in a pluralistic society, who can supply both breadth and rigor to institution building and repair, and who can bring to critical problems a highly developed capacity for clarifying value choices and for performance evaluation. (p. 273)

Presumably, an individual should be able to transfer such orientations to various particularized settings.

Numerous other analysts have attempted to define the skills abilities, and knowledge administrators should possess. Several scholars, including Gordon and Howell (1959) and Gordon (1967), have not considered the attributes to depend on, or to vary greatly with, the particular institutional area. Consequently, accentuation of boundaries in preparation appears to be unwarranted.

EFFECTING ECONOMIES IN PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Implicit in some general discussions of common versus specialized approaches is the suggestion that combining programs might be a more economical use of resources. The concern Knezevich (1967) voiced about the proliferation of preparation programs in educational administration can be extended to other fields as well. Particularly in the operation of multiple programs in smaller institutions there is a possibility that diffused effort, duplicated course offerings, and uncoordinated research are indeed uneconomical. It does not necessarily follow, however, that combined efforts would be more economical even though the program might be improved.

Increased economy and efficiency in preparing administrators might also result from increasing the range of their career alternatives. Administrators prepared to work in more than one institutional setting could conceivably help to balance shortages and surpluses of personnel in the various areas. Of course, increased efficiency in the total system that produces administrative personnel does not mean that all parts of the system would inevitably benefit equally. One area of specialization might have to

subsidize the others. On the whole, it seems that efficiency is not nearly as compelling an argument for modifying approaches to the study of administration as were some of the previous reasons.

STRATEGIES

The arguments for making the boundaries between specialties in administration more permeable—or eliminating them entirely—can lead to proposals for various modifications of existing practices in the study of administration and the training of administrators. Usually only the three major areas of administration—public, business, and education—are considered. However, the strategies presented are just as applicable to other institutional areas.

The most basic proposal involves merely creating an awareness of what developments in one specialization have to offer the scholar or practitioner in another and providing for some exchange through isolated seminars or research collaboration. At the other end of the continuum is the complete reorganization of administrative studies creating an integrated, generalized field that gives secondary, not primary, attention to institutional variations. The various possibilities can all be considered as strategies for recognizing, in different ways and to different degrees, commonalities in the study of administration.

At present, each specialized area can probably be assumed to have a general awareness of significant developments in other areas of administrative study. It is difficult to say how much exchange exists among the specialties in institutions whose disciplinary boundaries are clearly defined. Nevertheless, the climate of the times is conducive to various in-common strategies. These strategies include the development of joint courses, the redefinition of disciplinary boundaries, the creation of centers for the study of administration, and the implementation of the school of administration concept.

JOINT COURSES

One of the least threatening modifications of existing practices involves developing a limited common core of experiences for administrator trainees in the education, business, and public areas. Initially, this approach might include only the equivalent of a

quarter or semester course that could be extended to take in more topics (and time) as the areas of common interest and relevance are identified.

A specific example will illustrate the approach. In 1959-60, the University of Oregon experimented with a joint course. According to Wengert and others (1961), the goal of the undertaking was to sample the rich amount of material available in related disciplines and to develop "a basic course for advanced students whose interests lie in the administration of business, government or education" (p. 143). The course included topics on the current environment of organizations and the role of the administrator, as well as concepts, theories, and empirical findings from the social sciences.

The course relied on a central core of readings and allowed students to select from the vast amount of material available. Activities included lectures, discussions, panels, individual reports, and formal papers. The dean of the School of Business Administration expressed the hope that:

> . . . the materials assembled . . . will provide the basis for a future general course in administration that could appropriately become a basic part of the studies of all students in the professional schools. (Wengert and others 1961)

Although those associated with the course considered it a promising development, there is no evidence in recent catalogues of the University of Oregon professional schools that it has become a continuing part of or has had any significant influence on the definition of administrative studies.

Despite the apparent lack of permanent impact on practices, such experimental courses do validate the feasibility and the merits of developing common learning experiences for students enrolled in different administrative specialties.

REDEFINITION OF DISCIPLINARY BOUNDARIES

A second possible strategy involves redefinition of the content of present business administration and management studies. It is questionable whether the current designations of these schools accurately describe their content. Specifically, the possibility exists that present programs in business administration do (or, with little modification, could) prepare administrators for more than just management in business organizations.

The possibility that management studies have broader application than is normally assumed and could take the lead in developing a more general science of administration is a subject of debate. Recently, Yoon noted that "the field of management, as with other young healthy disciplines, must undergo a close and continuing scrutiny to seek its center and circumference" (1968, p. 279). In the light of discussions within the Academy of Management he asks whether "the discipline should redefine its scope of inquiry and take a leadership role in promoting general interest in the generic aspects of the study of administration" (p. 280). Furthermore, Yoon refers to LeBreton's (1967) earlier question whether the academy should take a leadership role in encouraging the development of pilot programs drawing a student body from the various professional schools. If adopted, programs would extend the already visible movement toward combining schools of business and public administration either administratively or through development of core curricula.

Yoon proposes continuing reassessment of the role of management departments.

> They will have to incorporate into their curricula, courses oriented toward administrative problems and environments of nonbusiness enterprises. In larger universities scholars of management may find an exciting new frontier of professional leadership in establishing closer ties with other professional schools. (p. 286)

It remains to be seen whether departments of management can be successful in modifying their curricula, in attracting students from the various institutional areas, and in producing graduates who will be acceptable to a broader market. No doubt, such expansion is bound to encounter some resistance from the other schools if it is not a collaborative undertaking.

CENTERS FOR THE STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION

The most productive way to develop the science of administration could be through the establishment of centers designed specifically to achieve that objective. The benefits to preparation programs would be indirect, but specific relationships could be worked out as the center develops.

Culbertson (1965) outlines one example of such a proposal in the form of a Graduate College of Public Policy and Administra-

tion. As he conceived it, the college staff would be recruited from basic and related disciplines as well as specialized areas of administrative study. The college would form an environment in which groups of scholars could focus on both the *is* and *ought* perspectives on public policy. While some members of the college could concern themselves more with substantive policy issues, others could concentrate on the development of knowledge that would inform the analysis of the issues, and still others could focus on the development of generic administrative study.

Culbertson proposed that the college could enter into a number of working relationships with schools or departments having specialized preparation programs for administrators. One alternative would be for the college merely to make its products available to the schools, a second would be to provide courses or seminars on policy issues of general concern, and a third might be to offer core courses in administrative processes or comparative administration.

In a similar proposal, Caldwell suggested that the most promising direction in shaping an organization for the study of administration would be "the establishment of centers, institutes, or schools to facilitate multidisciplinary focus upon administrative phenomena" (1968, p. 217).

Caldwell's proposal is very similar to the Administrative Science Center initiated by Litchfield and Thompson at the University of Pittsburgh in the midfifties. The concept for the Pittsburgh center grew from a conviction that there was merit in developing the generic study of administration and in trying to remedy the deficiencies of fragmented approaches. The central goal was to mobilize faculty, students, scholars, and researchers from various disciplines to increase the flow of research and ideas on the generic process of administration. The staff of the center remained small throughout its history and consisted of (at various times) scholars from anthropology, sociology, and social psychology, and a few graduate assistants working on degree programs in specialized areas. Some of the staff held joint appointments with other schools.

The center was not intended to grant degrees, but it did attempt to influence the professional schools through such activities as seminars and publications. At one stage an interdepartmental graduate course was offered that attracted students from business, sociology, public affairs, nursing, and other fields (Thompson 1971). The center was terminated some years ago for financial

reasons (Wynn 1971).

Even the nonfinancial difficulties of establishing such an institute or school are not to be underestimated. It is no simple task to break scholars away from their affiliations, both disciplinary and institutional, to develop a new identity. Nor is the task of engaging in interdisciplinary studies without frustrations. It is easy to see why no similar centers have been established in response to the challenge.

SCHOOL OF ADMINISTRATION CONCEPT

The one strategy that holds promise of achieving the outcomes of all other strategies combined—common courses, integrated programs, development of administrative science, research, and training—is the graduate school of administration. In general, the strategy involves the establishment of centers or schools that would recognize and develop the generic aspects of administration as well as the specialized aspects of each particular field.

Discussing the possible directions in which public administration might move, Hinderaker proposed:

> Instead of stopping at this point with a Graduate School of Public Administration, as we already have at some institutions, might it not be desirable to go beyond into a new union with business and educational administration? (Depending on the campus situation, that could also include such other fields as welfare and hospital administration, which is now closely allied to business administration in a few instances.) I suggest this alternative even though the few attempts which have been made to combine business and public administration have not, for varying reasons, been notably successful. (1963, pp. 8-9)

In an informal survey of people in selected disciplines at various universities, Hinderaker found both support for and opposition to such a concept. The support tended to come from those associated with business and educational administration; the few opponents were in public administration. Hinderaker and some of his associates were not dissuaded. Their views led to the establishment in 1966 of the Graduate School of Administration on the Irvine Campus of the University of California.

More recently, Gordon proposed:

> The next big step in education for present and future executives may well be the more complete flowering of the graduate school of

> administration. The common element is a clustering of intellectual and applied interests around the task of building and administering complex organizations to carry off differing purposes in quite varied settings. (1967, p. 351)

This concept receives support from students of administration who believe either that common elements can be identified or that an attempt should be made to determine if they are identifiable. Gordon notes that for these people:

> . . . the idea of a common center for learning more about a set of variables called administration and more of what is entailed in being an administrator under varied conditions has attraction. (p. 352)

The curriculum content of such a school will be determined by whatever conceptions are held of administrators, such as the generalist-specialist concept proposed by Snyder. Regardless of the specific conception, the content of the program would not and should not be merely a reorganization of existing administrative studies. Snyder conceives that designing courses and other experiences will involve "squeezing" various disciplines to distill and present the knowledge relevant to organizational and administrative phenomena (1969, p. 288). The social and behavioral sciences as well as the schools that have developed analytical tools are obvious potential contributors.

Definition of content cannot be determined a priori but must be a continuous process. For this reason recruiting faculty, developing interdisciplinary research, and creating effective teaching teams are crucial to the success of such a venture. Unless these features can be built into the structure and operation of the school, the program will become fragmented and lose its potential.

The concept of such a school shares considerable appeal with the concept of a center for administrative studies; both have similar difficulties inherent in their establishment and development. Gordon (1967) proposes that in view of the limited implementation experience, such a school must be considered only as a strategy for developing the field. Caldwell cautions that "no dramatic revelations . . . should be expected from the first of such institutions to be established. Time will be required" (1968, p. 217).

The extent to which progress has been made in implementing the concept of a graduate school of administration—as well as other strategies—is indicated by the practices described in the following chapter.

3

Present Practices

Rationales and strategies take on full meaning only when manifested in actual ongoing programs. To determine how current practices relate to thought, an attempt was made to obtain descriptions of approaches providing some form of training in-common for two or more administrative specialties. As mentioned in the introduction, the preparation programs considered suitable for detailed descriptions are few in number.

The programs reviewed can be placed in two broad categories: those based on a broadened conception of management studies or involving combined programs, and those classified as integrated approaches.

General Management and Combined Programs

Management boundaries have already been redefined in some schools that offer management programs with applications beyond

the business-industrial area. Another development has been the combination of business and public administration schools. At times, however, this seems to involve only an administrative change within the university rather than any integration of programs. Other combinations, such as education-business, seem to occur far less frequently. Since only one such program is described here, the description is fairly detailed.

MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

The observation that administration takes place within an organizational setting and involves similar skills in different organizations has led some schools to claim, either implicitly or explicitly, that their programs prepare people to work in a variety of organizations.

Most frequently, a claim is made for the suitability of a program preparing people for careers in both public and private organizations. This claim tends to rest on the emphasis given in training programs to basic disciplines and analytic techniques that are assumed to be relevant to a wide variety of organizations. Among the institutions indicating that their programs are more general than those of a business school are Carnegie-Mellon University (1971), Yale University (1971), and Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Alfred P. Sloan School of Management (1971).

Carnegie-Mellon seeks to prepare students for general management in business and government by emphasizing analytic competence and the theoretical and conceptual basis of managerial practice.

The Yale program also adopts a broad approach and indicates that "teaching and research in Administrative Sciences are directed toward the development and application of behavioral/social sciences to the study of goal-seeking organizations" (p. 1). The program attempts to "establish the phenomena that are intrinsic to goal-seeking entities, be they a business, a governmental department, a church, a hospital or any other viable organized group" (p. 1). The program permits specialization in two major areas: organizational behavior or quantitative skills. The objective of the M.A. program is "to prepare persons to assume leadership responsibilities in private and public enterprises" (p. 4). It is claimed that advanced study in the areas of management science or organizational behavior may be particularly appropriate for such

managment careers.

The implicit linking of management in various types of organizations is carried further in the MIT program, which is designed to prepare people "to function effectively as professional managers in private and public organizations" (p. 5). Although the majority of candidates are aiming for careers in business and government, more are expressing interest in organizations such as hospitals, schools, cities, and government agencies. The school suggests:

> The basic approaches to problem solving and decision making developed for industry are applicable to nonindustrial organizations. The School encourages applications from those who seek careers in a wide range of enterprises. (1971, p. 5)

Although no individual programs are outlined, presumably the general program flexibility accommodates student interests in a variety of career aspirations.

Because general management studies usually overlook the unique characteristics of organizations in the different institutional areas, it must be concluded that they prepare people to perform a rather limited set of administrative functions. The skills developed are most likely to be used in staff capacities in a wide range of organizations. The ease with which individuals could move into line positions would vary with the type of organization.

COMBINED BUSINESS-PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The general management programs claim to have a relevance beyond business administration because of their flexible and conceptual approaches to the study of administration. Some other schools have been much more explicit in their efforts to provide common yet differentiated programs for people intent on varied careers. This is done through core programs such as the ones at Cornell University (1971) and York University (1971).

The programs offered in the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell University lead to degrees in business, public, and health services administration. Although the programs appear to be quite discrete, the major portion of formal study during the first year of a two-year program consists of courses common to all three areas. These common courses are in accounting, quantitative methods, macro- and microeconomics, institutions and values in society, organization theory and behavior, and the

computer and decision-making. The remainder of the first-year program consists of electives, while the second year is devoted to concentration in the special field of study.

York University in Toronto provides a very similar program for both public and business administration:

> The Faculty of Administrative Sciences is committed to the concept that there is a common thread of administrative skill and knowledge running through the managerial tasks of all organizations, both large and small, public and private. (1971, p. 19)

Although the program contains schools of both business and public administration, there is a common core of studies for candidates in the schools. This core is intended to provide "an understanding of the basic disciplines, analytic skills and institutional interfaces which represent the intellectual foundations of all administrative practice" (p. 34). The core contains courses on the environmental framework of management, accounting and control, macro- and microeconomics, quantitative methods, behavioral components, and issues in organization.

Education is mentioned infrequently among the organizations for which such programs are considered relevant. No doubt, the programs are assumed to be appropriate for the "business management" aspects of educational administration. However, seldom or never is reference made to the more curriculum-oriented educational administrator.

EDUCATION-BUSINESS JOINT PROGRAM

Stanford University developed the Joint Program in Educational Administration in response to a need for a "new breed" of manager-administrators who would be better prepared than were their predecessors to cope with current and future problems of urban school administration. As perceived by the program developers, the need was to prepare people familiar with the urban crisis and possessing financial-management skills enabling them to cope effectively with social, political, economic, and educational problems. The program is not designed to prepare current school business officers. Instead, according to Kirst, it is to

> prepare top administrators who will have an important financial decision-making role in urban schools, state and federal education agencies, and private nonprofit organizations. (1970, p. 2)

This important decision-making role also might be played in senior staff positions as advisors to top level administrators as well as in the administrative positions themselves. Experience with the program indicates that it serves both the generalist administrator who wishes to develop some competence in financial skills and the specialist who might be oriented more to a staff-advisory position.

The Joint Program consists of three years in which candidates pursue studies qualifying them for both the Master of Educational Administration degree (MEA)—awarded jointly by the School of Education and the Graduate School of Business—and the doctorate in education. Existing courses and other educational experiences were used to a large extent in designing the program, but modifications were made and new experiences added.

The program has no specific academic prerequisite and is open to a limited number of recent baccalaureate graduates, experienced teachers and administrators, and persons with work experience in social action agencies. In addition to the usual selection criteria of academic ability, aptitude, and leadership potential, consideration is given to the individual's commitment to urban problems.

Although programs of study are individualized, they are intended to prepare the administrator to work in situations in which financial constraints are high and efficient operations must be achieved through understanding goals and setting priorities. The Joint Program has four major components: administrative-analytical core, foundation work in education, contact with the reality of urban problems and the agencies attempting to cope with them, and integration of learnings within and across components.

The basic administrative-analytical core is provided by courses from the Graduate School of Business. The courses selected as a required core are foundation subjects underlying the professional discipline and practice of administration. These include managerial accounting, business economics, organizational behavior, marketing management, and others to a total of about ten quarter-courses. This core forms the major portion of work during the first year of study; with elective and other courses from the Graduate School of Business, it comprises at least one-half of the course units in the MEA program.

The educational foundation component is intended to ground students in educational goals, curriculum, and the normative dimension of the problems they will likely face on the job. This compo-

nent consists largely of courses on curriculum, philosophy of education, culture and education, and psychological foundations of education, among others. There is considerable flexibility in developing this component, including the possibility of course credit internships for students with limited experience in education.

The third component—contact with the reality of the urban situation—is provided by a number of short-term revolving internships during the second year of study. During these internships, each lasting about one month, candidates are brought into contact with a range of urban agencies: schools; local, federal and state agencies; community groups; labor and professional groups; and so forth. A number of outcomes are anticipated from the internships; the foremost is that candidates will become familiar with a range of urban problems and their interrelationships, and with the various agencies attempting to cope with them. It is hoped the internship experiences will set the stage for future collaboration among administrators, community groups, politicians, and social action agencies, and for more effective social delivery systems.

The final component consists of specific activities intended to integrate experiences both within and across the components. A course entitled Enterprise Direction, offered by the Business School, brings together the specialized learnings in the administrative core. The course acquaints students with some of the special problems in setting goals for an organization and with developing strategies for coping with goal-related planning problems. A similar seminar on Poverty and Urban Education integrates the internship experiences by focusing on issues confronting the urban school administrator: organization and control of schools, racial factors, and analysis of poverty. A two-quarter sequence—the Joint Seminar in Educational Administration—relates learnings from the administrative core more closely to specific problems and issues in educational administration. In this sequence professors from the Business School and the School of Education come together to discuss the common and unique characteristics of administrative action.

In addition to these four components, there are opportunities for individualizing programs through selection of electives and other credit experiences. Although the MEA normally requires the first two years of study, the flexibility of the doctorate program usually enables the candidate to apply most or all of his MEA course work toward the doctorate. The doctorate has no specific course

requirements, but candidates are expected to develop competence in four core areas: studies in curriculum, instruction, and administration; behavioral science studies; normative studies; and inquiry skills. Specific programs are designed within this broad framework. Candidates are encouraged but not required to do their research in the application of new procedures to the operation and management of an educational institution. The doctoral phase of the studies includes a significant stress on curriculum design and learning processes.

In summary, some observations might be made about the Joint Program to highlight its unique characteristics. First, its point of departure is the belief there is need for a set of specialized skills for a function not now being performed adequately. Second, it uses the resources of an existing administrative specialty to develop these skills while still retaining a focus on education. As a result, the Joint Program facilitates development of both administrative and institutional specialization. The analytical core is very similar to that of the general management programs and other combined programs. Because attention is given to both general and specific aspects of administration, joint programs appear to hold considerable promise as a strategy for introducing training-in-common.

Integrated Programs

There are few integrated programs of study and preparation that attempt to develop a generic emphasis on administration. Three have been selected for detailed review because of their unique features. These are the programs developed at the Irvine Campus of the University of California, Sangamon State University in Springfield, Illinois, and the Regina Campus of the University of Saskatchewan. These three programs are probably the most progressive existing practices in the development of training-in-common for educational, business, and public administrators.

INTEGRATED PREPARATION AND GRADUATE STUDY

The University of California at Irvine has offered a common, or integrated, program in administration since September 1966. The concept of a graduate school of administration providing general professional and academic education for administrators through the integration of a variety of perspectives and disciplines was included

in academic planning for the new campus. The subsequent establishment of the school and development of programs have proved to be highly significant in defining and implementing generic studies of administration. No discussion of training-in-common would be complete without adequate attention to the content of the Irvine programs.

The Graduate School of Administration grants the Master of Science and the Doctor of Philosophy in Administration degrees. At each degree level specialization is possible in one of three institutional areas: education, business, or public administration. The programs' characteristics and specific requirements derive from a number of underlying assumptions that define the programs' philosophy. These assumptions include:

- Developments in such basic areas as management science, the behavioral and social sciences, and the study of organizations have reached a stage making it reasonable to conceive and develop an integrated curriculum for preparing administrators to work in education, business, and government.
- An integrated program should be based on interdisciplinary collaboration around a common interest in organizations and their management. This common interest and the need for a deeper understanding of the administration of organizations should make the traditional academic and disciplinary boundaries less significant in defining the content of studies and the involvement of faculty.
- An attempt should be made to integrate generalist and specialist roles in administration. The generalist role involves basic understanding of administrative processes and techniques in a variety of organizational settings. Specialization is based on knowledge of a particular institutional area and of a particular discipline or set of technical tools closely associated with administration.
- An adequate preparation program should attempt to integrate the functions of teaching, research, and service, the program should offer experiences that will provide professional preparation, extend the search for new knowledge, and test and refine existing administrative theory.

Candidates for the school are recruited from all academic and professional areas. Some background is assumed, or must be acquired, in mathematics (through calculus), elementary statistics, economics, psychology or sociology, and political science. The Master of Science in Administration normally requires two full academic years of study. For many candidates this will also include related academic or job-centered work during either or both of the

summers preceding the first and second years.

Joint three-two programs are also possible in three areas: computer science, engineering, and social sciences. In such joint, or combined programs, the candidate spends three years in one of these undergraduate schools or departments and two years in the Graduate School of Administration. Requirements for the bachelor's degree are completed by the end of the fourth year and the M.S. is received at the end of the fifth year. The joint programs offer yet another opportunity for specialization in areas closely related to administration or particular institutional areas.

The M.S. Program consists of twenty-three quarter-courses, twelve of which are required core courses in administration. Included in the twelve are six single-quarter courses and three two-quarter-sequences. The single-quarter courses are:

microeconomics: a mathematically rigorous analysis of the general theory of equilibrium of individual economic decision units

macroeconomics: inquiry into principal determinants of the level of national income and employment, and application of macroeconomic analysis to public policy questions

accounting and financial control: including short-run finance and capital budgeting

interpersonal dynamics: including developing awareness and understanding of interpersonal behavior as well as increased competence in use of interpersonal skills such as communication and conflict resolution

manpower utilization and labor relations: particularly the staffing function and the organization's relationships with individual members and organized groups of members

workshop in administrative problem solving: either a common field project in which participants organize, plan, and formulate action strategies, or a simulation activity that gives experience in action and feedback-analysis

The two-quarter sequences cover three major areas:

quantitative methods: attempting to provide the quantitative basis for managerial decision-making though developing skills in computer programming, modelling, and various facets of computer simulation.

organization theories and models: descriptions of organizational behavior in a wide range of organizations and societies leading to such topics as goals and objectives of organizations, structure, theories of management, motivation, and change.

seminar in educational, business, or public administration: This seminar is intended to provide the institutional specialization for administrators. The seminar in educational administration, for example, presents a broad approach to the process of administration in educational organizations, including problems of policies and policy-making, financing, and forecasts and trends in higher education. Attention is given to current problems and a variety of resources is used. The seminars in business and public administration develop perspectives appropriate to those particular fields.

The core courses, with the exception of the quantitative methods, may be taken in either the first or second year. Students complete their requirements by selecting electives from courses in the School of Administration—such as social change, conflict and conflict resolution, or an additional term of organization theories—or in other schools if the courses are logical extensions of their programs. The course requirements and other activities contribute to a range of intended educational goals: general knowledge, conceptual and empirical knowledge of organizations, specific knowledge about a particular area of administration, management techniques and other skills, and a professional orientation.

The Ph.D. degree in administration requires at least three and probably four years of full-time effort following the undergraduate degree. Not all this time need be spent in university residence in the technical sense. The actual residence period will be influenced by the field experience, if any, and the research undertaken by the candidate. The basic requirements for the Ph.D. are extensive preparation in the core disciplines and the areas of technical competence defined by the M.S. requirements, and preparation and demonstrated competence in research including the completion of a significant research project.

The individual programs that can be developed within the general framework can provide the initial preparation for people moving into such administrative roles as corporate managers, program directors, federal executives, administrators for various levels of the educational system, organizational staff experts, hospital administrators, policy analysts, researchers, and faculty members. The common elements of the preparation programs increase the likelihood that administrators in different organizations, and at different levels, may be able to communicate with one another more effectively and also move more easily from one organization to

another in response to societal needs, organizational demands, and individual preferences.

COMMON CORE AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL

The Master of Arts (Administration) program at Sangamon State University became operational during the 1970-71 academic year. It is the outcome of several years of planning to develop an in-common program for students with an interest or involvement in educational, business, or public administration. The immediate success the program had in attracting students from these areas is evidenced by the enrollment during the winter quarter of 1971. Of the 151 students enrolled, 45 identified with the public area, 66 with business, and 41 with education. In view of its large and diverse enrollment, the program merits particular attention.

The Sangamon State University program draws its distinctive characteristics from a number of assumptions and subsidiary objectives that determine the general rationale and practices:

- The program serves part-time students who are employed in governmental, business, and educational organizations, as well as full-time graduate students. Provisions are also made for integrating undergraduate programs with a three-year master's program.
- The program is designed for students with a variety of undergraduate backgrounds; there are no admission requirements beyond the baccalaureate.
- The general requirements allow individualized programs. Students may select courses from any disciplinary area relevant to their interests, needs, or career aspirations. In addition to formal courses, learning experiences are provided through independent study, programmed instructional materials, and noncredit workshops.
- The program is multidisciplinary and stresses the application of concepts from a range of behavioral sciences rather than the development of narrow technical skills. In addition to drawing upon such basic disciplines as psychology and sociology, various parts of the program develop concepts and issues from urban planning, communication theory, system engineering, and computer technology.
- The programs have a definite public affairs emphasis, particularly for students preparing for positions in government or education. Students are expected to become familiar with the analysis of current issues through study and interaction with students in other specialties. The program also encourages involvement with the community through resource persons and faculty and student projects.

- The program recognizes the importance of such administrative skills as communication and problem solving. Work experience may be included for those who do not have, or are not currently engaged in, administrative practice.

The general requirement of the program is completion of twelve courses of five quarter-hours each. About half of these twelve courses are drawn from a common core, and the remainder from the major area of concentration—business, public, or school administration. Other requirements include competence in communication skills and participation in a public affairs colloquium. The subject of the colloquium may vary depending on whether a student's interest is in race relations, censorship, or other current issues. The common, or generic, core is based on the assumption that administrators in all areas should be knowledgeable about the human resources and decision-making processes of an organization. Consequently, the core courses deal generally with the human and decision-making dimensions of administrative tasks, and emphasize the application of behavioral science concepts and the development of management skills.

In contrast, study in each of the three specialized areas is based on the assumption that the politico-legal environments and functions of organizations differ. As a result, about one-half of a student's program consists of courses that examine his particular area of administration, including such aspects as the nature of and relationships with relevant environments, specific administrative functions, and policy-making.

The core courses include the behavioral science-based aspects of administrative study and management techniques. Specific courses range from computer-assisted decision-making and systems design to human resource management and organizational change. Although there are no prescribed courses in the core, two are highly recommended for all students: a course on quantitative tools for decision-making and an integrative seminar to be taken during the final quarter. The integrative seminar, Design and Implementation of the Organization's Strategy, views the organization from the perspective of the chief administrator or policy-maker. The seminar stresses such tasks as conceptualizing the role of the chief executive, coping with environmental and institutional constraints, resolving competing objectives, and developing organizational structures.

The generic core's contribution to individual programs is illustrated in table 1, which lists specific courses that might be taken by students preparing for positions in public, business, and school administration.

TABLE 1

City Manager	*Middle Manager Business*	*School Principal*
Organization Theory	Organization Theory	Psychology of Human Development
Theories and Methods of Organizational Change	Theories and Methods of Organizational Change	Theories and Methods of Organizational Change
Leadership Theory and Styles	Management Information Systems	Leadership Theory and Styles
Human Resource Management	Human Resource Management	
	Organizational Behavior	Organizational Behavior
	Quantitative Tools for Decision Making	
Integrative Seminar	Integrative Seminar	Integrative Seminar

These sample programs show that the future principal might have only two courses and the integrative seminar in common with the other two candidates. Similarly, the city and business managers might have only three courses in common. It is possible, however, that the public affairs colloquium might also be experienced commonly by two or all three students. Evidently, the generic core at Sangamon State is a pool of courses from which individual students can choose certain areas of study. It is not a set of experiences common to all students. The common portion is, generally, the behavioral science-based study of administration, the analysis

of social issues, and the attempt to integrate learnings into an administrator's world view.

The program recognizes that the teaching quality in the generic core courses is of utmost importance. Faculty members must be familiar with both the basic disciplines from which the studies draw their content and the disicpline's potential application in the various specialties. The faculty at Sangamon is recruited from behavioral science departments as well as from those departments and schools in which educational, business, and public administration have traditionally been offered. Hope is expressed that through faculty dialogue and faculty-student interaction some of the orientations from the specialized areas of administration can be transmitted in the generic core. This seems to be particularly important in view of the broad and flexible approach taken to the definition of the generic core component of an individual's program.

INTEGRATED UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

The program in operation at the Regina Campus of the University of Saskatchewan since 1966 is unique in that it attempts to cope at the undergraduate level with the issue of common versus specialized programs of study in administration. In general, the narrowness of the traditional school of business administration is rejected in favor of a broadened program. This program, which leads to the Bachelor of Administration degree in four years, prepares people for administrative careers in a variety of organizations: government, business, education, health, and others. Accordingly, the program emphasizes general management rather than business.

Bolstad (1968) outlines some of the assumptions underlying the programs of study:

- Administration is a universal phenomenon in all types of organizations; it is possible to define a program of study or a body of knowledge that is universally applicable.
- The undergraduate level is not the stage for administrative specialization in an institutional sense. Such specialization is more appropriate at the graduate level or can be developed through actual work and experience in organizations. The program is recognized as only the beginning of learning about administration that will continue throughout an individual's career.
- Although specialization is desirable, it should be specialization in a disciplinary sense and not in a narrow vocational sense. Disciplinary

specialization can lead to preparation for specific types of administrative functions without placing limits on the organization in which the functions are likely to be performed.

- The development of general skills in problem-solving and analysis might be more important than learning a specific body of knowledge. Nevertheless, graduates must have sufficient familiarity with specialized tools and techniques to enable them to begin work in administrative positions.

These and related assumptions were the starting point for developing an eight-semester program that includes a "mix" of course work providing the foundation for administrative studies, breadth in applied areas, and a degree of specialization in an area closely related to practice. The program's designers attempted to use the resources of other departments to develop the behavioral science and quantitative specializations. Additional linkages were developed through staff members who hold joint appointments with other faculties.

The first four semesters of the program provide a broad foundation for administrative studies. Actual course work includes such fields as political science, economics, mathematics, psychology, sociology, research methodology, and accounting. At this stage, courses in administration and applied areas include legal institutions, organizations and the individual, costs accounting, and an introduction to the administrative process. In the final two years of study students specialize in one of three areas: behavioral sciences, quantitative analysis, or economics. In each specialized area, four courses in the basic disciplines and four in administrative applications of those disciplines are required.

To avoid premature narrow specialization, a candidate is also required to take two courses in each of the two areas outside his concentration. The specialist in the behavioral sciences, for example, also studies quantitative work and economics. As a result, the area of specialization may serve as the point of entry to an administrative career, but it need not restrict the administrator-to-be to a particular type of work.

The program culminates with two required courses on research and problem-solving. One course examines the role and uses of research in administration. It includes conceptualizing an administrative problem in research terms and developing techniques to solve the problem. The Seminar in Administrative Problem-Solving assists students in integrating and applying some of the program's more

specialized material. This application is done, in part, through the completion of a project related to a current administrative problem.

Beyond the required courses, four electives may be used to provide greater depth in the disciplinary area or greater depth or breadth at the applied administrative level.

Another approach to administrative preparation available at Regina is the combined-degree programs that include law-administration and arts-administration. Through a combined program a student can meet the requirements for two degrees in less time than is required if they are taken separately. Bolstad (1968) sees considerable merit in the combined programs:

> . . . it is possible to develop combined programs in many areas where a more specialized approach is normally taken to teaching administration. People could prepare for technical and administrative careers in a variety of organizations and institutions . . . libraries, welfare agencies, schools, hospitals, the military, scientific agencies, churches, etc. by combining studies in a general administration program and in other professional fields. (p. 15)

At the time of writing, no such combined program has been developed with education.

Wegner (1970b) identifies a number of problems associated with the establishment of an integrated program. Among the major difficulties are developing appropriate courses and finding faculty who have the necessary orientation. At Regina, most of the faculty do come from a particular institutional area of specialization. However, hope is expressed that through close association they will transmit their diverse views to the students and to one another. There are indications that the graduates of the program are viewed favorably by employers, that graduates do find employment in a variety of organizations, and that the reputation of the program is growing. These indications reflect favorably on both the concept of a more general preparation program and the specific developments at Regina.

Several observations can be made about the program's emphasis and content. The first is that content tends to be focused on technical-administrative tasks with limited attention to more general issues and problems in organization management. Presumably, the development of broadened conceptions of administration and institutional specialization are left to the graduate schools. Whether these should be left exclusively to the graduate level might bear some reconsideration.

A second observation is that although the program is more general than the traditional business administration program, the course structure still reflects long-standing areas of emphasis. Finally, schools and school systems are not prominent among the organizations for which the administrative preparation is intended. Perhaps this is only by accident; nevertheless, one does get the distinct impression that the program still favors the business function in a relatively restricted range of organizations.

COMPARISONS

Despite considerable variation in the programs described, there appears to be substantial agreement on what should be common in the study of administrative specializations and in the preparation programs for those areas.

Whether it is a broadly oriented management program, a joint program, or an integrated approach, the significance of the basic social/behavioral sciences and quantitative studies is recognized. These disciplines serve as the basis for more specific studies of organizational behavior and administrative processes. Programs either implicitly or explicitly include the study and development of both quantitative and human managerial skills in order to improve the administrator's ability to carry out various functions and to solve organizational problems. These two broad areas form the basic core of in-common administrative studies.

The different programs vary widely in their inclusion of content relating to particular institutional areas. The generalized management programs contain the least emphasis on institutional areas outside the public and business domains. This emphasis seems to imply that the relevance of these programs to the administrative processes of other types of organizations is generally limited to the financial and personnel functions. It is assumed that familiarity with the unique characteristics of a particular type of organization can best be developed on the job. The preparation in these generalized management programs also seems to be oriented toward the performance of specialized functions at the middle and lower managerial levels. Career paths for administrators would probably follow these functional specializations upward or laterally into more generalized administration.

The joint and integrated programs described offer greater

opportunities for preparation for positions in specific institutional areas than do the general management programs. These opportunities take the form of courses and actual work experience gained through either internships or part-time employment. Such experience develops familiarity and competence in coping with unique characteristics, circumstances, and policy issues. Stanford emphasizes the internship for gaining this experience; Sangamon assumes its part-time students obtain experience through jobs; Irvine assumes its students obtain some experience during the summer periods. In view of the emphasis Irvine and Stanford give to both the common and the specialized needs of prospective administrators, these programs seem to achieve an appropriate balance. Sangamon is very similar, but takes a much more flexible approach to defining the generic core.

All these programs can be viewed as the implementation of different strategies for recognizing the generic aspects of administrative studies and the common needs of prospective administrators. The appropriateness of the adoption of any one of these strategies will be conditioned by the particular goals of a program and the circumstances in which it is developed. All the programs are viable models for developing in-common programs of preparation for both researchers and practicing administrators.

4

Problems and Prospects

A review of both thought and practice reveals that much of the "knowledge" about training-in-common consists of statements about the *possible* beneficial outcomes of common training programs; little, if any, consists of demonstrated benefits. Nevertheless, the rationales for training-in-common apparently are so convincing that a number of centers and schools have been stimulated to implement in-common approaches. One way or another, all the specific rationales are reflected in the various programs described. These strategies add significant new characteristics to training programs: inclusion of new elements, broadened perspectives, increased career alternatives, and contributions toward development of the science of administration. Different programs or strategies place varying emphases on these desirable outcomes.

Practice clearly demonstrates the feasibility of developing combined, joint, or integrated programs and indicates the variety of ways in which training-in-common can be carried out. Although the specifics of programs vary in detail, there appears to be consensus

on what constitutes generic aspects of administrative study. "Knowledge" in terms of what might be done is well advanced; the present state of training-in-common is highly encouraging. Nevertheless, whether training-in-common is for the most part a desirable approach is difficult to determine in the absence of carefully formulated evaluations of existing programs. There is little knowledge of the extent to which present programs are achieving objectives. We have not even begun to ask *which* type of training-in-common is most appropriate under specific circumstances. New programs must still be developed on a high degree of faith in their advantages and on rationales that are not well-grounded in empirical data.

Perhaps the most significant finding of this study is the very limited extent to which training-in-common has been implemented, even when *common* is broadly defined. Although the accomplishments of the programs described earlier represent significant progress toward developing generic approaches to administrative training, they clearly are only isolated developments. They do not indicate a general trend toward a broadened conception of administrator training or the development of administrative study. Such limited experimentation suggests there is resistance to the development of training-in-common. If further significant developments in common programs are to appear, the sources of resistance must be identified, analyzed, and overcome.

Problems

Perhaps a major factor in the relatively slow progress made toward development of training-in-common and generic study of administration is the limited attention they have received in print. Inadequate knowledge and analysis of this and related subjects no doubt have contributed to the limited attention generic study has received from program planners. The related subjects are important because the shape preparation programs take depends, in part, on developments in the science of administration, clarification of the common and the unique characteristics of organization administration, and overcoming boundary defenses of specialized areas of administrative study. Finally, some of the organizational and institutional barriers to training-in-common must also be recognized if they are to be eliminated.

ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE OR ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALTIES

There seemed to be more interest in and optimism about the development of a science of administration a decade or two ago than there has been in more recent years. In the past couple of decades the amount of theory and empirical research in areas highly relevant to the development of administrative science has expanded vastly. Nevertheless, the synthesizing and collating that might have stimulated the development of administration qua administration seem to be lacking.

Only a few issues after *Administrative Science Quarterly* was founded, Boulding (1958) carried out an analysis to determine the content of the emerging administrative science. Today, after much empirical research and the publication of many volumes, no one seems to have carried out a similar analysis of what direction the field is taking. The optimism in the statements by Litchfield (1956) and Thompson (1956) has not stimulated other scholars to build systematically a science of administration per se. There have been some attempts to make comparative studies, to develop generalizations, and to theorize about administration in an institution-free sense. But there is no systematic body of thought on administration qua administration. No doubt, this lack retards the development of generic approaches to prepare administrators.

Proponents of training-in-common hold that the development of the science will be one of the products of generic approaches; to some extent, however, it may also be a precondition. A generally agreed upon body of study is essential if the administrative specialties are to be pried from their present locations. Until an adequate body of content is generally recognized as forming the core of the study of administration, public administration will find it more comfortable to associate with political science and educational administration with education. In large measure, this is precisely what has happened.

The foregoing comments draw attention to a related trend hampering the adoption of a generic approach to administration—developments in individual specialized fields. Interest in administration qua administration appeared at about the same time as the great interest in the behavioral/social sciences and their contribution to the study of administration. In the past decade or so, each specialty has borrowed from the basic disciplines to such an extent that it has had little reason to rely greatly on the other specialties.

Although similarities in interests are once again appearing—largely as a result of drawing on basically the same body of content in behavioral and quantitative studies—in the interval many scholars in specialized fields of administration found it much more comfortable to identify with the basic disciplines than with the science of administration. In each field of administrative study it is probably much easier to find those who identify themselves as sociologists, psychologists, and mathematicians than it is to identify specialists in administrative processes or in the comparative study of administration. Perhaps now is an appropriate time to urge the disciplinary specialists to combine their talents toward development of more general administrative studies.

COMMON AND UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS

Closely related to the problem of developing a science of administration is the task of identifying those characteristics common to all organizations and those unique to organizations in a particular institutional area. This task would seem to be a prerequisite to identifying the general and the specific aspects of administrative processes. Until there are better analyses of these similarities and differences, training-in-common will flounder. The promise of common approaches will be overshadowed by the possibility that the common may be far less important than the unique. Consequently, fear that emphasizing common elements may do the prospective administrator a disservice will continue.

Mayntz presents the dilemma clearly when discussing the development of organization theory:

> The value of an organization concept so far removed from the concrete reality has repeatedly been challenged especially in countries where social science is more historically oriented and where interest in abstract system theory is correspondingly weak. Where the historically specific features of social phenomena are emphasized, it may well appear that the differences between organizations are much more decisive than what they have in common, so that it seems scientifically fruitless to compromise all of them under one concept. The major critical argument which follows is that propositions which hold for such diverse phenomena as an army, a trade union, and a university, must necessarily be either trivial or so abstract as to tell hardly anything of interest about concrete reality. (1964, p. 113)

Of course, one must hope there is a fruitful area of study between

the meaningless abstract and the trivial. Generic approaches must focus on this area, where the importance of further developmental work is clear.

Several contributors to a volume edited by Leu and Rudman (1963) discuss issues and problems in defining common and specialized learnings in preparation programs for school administrators. Whereas most of the writers focus on school administration, Culbertson (1963) considers what content might be common to preparation for all administrators and what proportion of the program it might include. He suggests that the greatest areas of commonality lie in such administrative processes as communicating, making decisions, handling morale, and coping with change. He proposes that from one-fourth to one-third of the content in two-year preparatory programs be focused on developing competence in these processes; this portion of the content could be common for all administrators. However, when preparation programs for specific administrative positions were examined by other contributors to the Leu and Rudman volume, the list of specialized needs seemed so lengthy as to leave little room for development of the more common approaches.

Snyder raises the related question whether knowledge and experience in administration are transferable from one institutional sector to another. He concludes that an a priori answer to the question is risky because:

> . . . we have not done the empirical research which would be necessary to tell us to what extent knowledge and experience are in fact transferable; second, we have not had enough professional programs based on this conviction to permit convincing evaluation. (1969, pp. 282-3)

Problems concerning the transferability of knowledge and the identification of what is common and generalizable about both administration and organizations will continue to impede the development of generic programs. Although convincing arguments for commonalities can be presented, additional analyses and research are needed.

OVERCOMING BOUNDARY DEFENSE

Although all the various specialized areas of administrative study can claim scholars who advocate emphasizing commonalities and

generic approaches, the boundaries of these disciplines have been highly resistant to change. Proponents of the generic approach receive a polite hearing from their colleagues only until the prospect of major changes in the organization of the fields becomes real. Then other voices are heard and the boundaries between disciplines are drawn more tightly. Each field recognizes the common elements as long as the identities of individual areas of study are not lost. Nowhere is this more evident than in the debate taking place in public administration.

The current trend in public administration to move away from a narrow political science perspective was mentioned earlier. This move raises some obvious questions. Where should it move? What relationships should it have to other administrative studies and to the basic disciplines? Interestingly, these questions are not restricted to the North American continent. After reviewing some European publications in the field, Ridley surmised:

> As the study of public administration becomes less institutional so it becomes less part of the study of Government and less part of political science. Not that modern political science is predominantly institutional: the behavioral approach of our time is focused on functions and processes. But if we study public administration in that way, it tends to become part of the study of administration *tout court.* (1968, p. 443)

Several writers, among them Caldwell (1968), Henderson (1966), and Waldo (1968), view public administration as having much in common with other areas of administrative study. The debate focuses on how far from political science the study should move.

Riggs feels that transferring the study of public administration to a professional school would be just as disastrous as leaving the training of administrators in the political science department. He proposes that the best solution is to:

> . . . establish professional schools for the public service, and perhaps also for persons planning careers as politicians and as administrators of philanthropic and social service organizations. They will need to be taught by political scientists and by sociologists, statisticians, historians, economists, and others, just as are their counterparts in schools of business administration. But meanwhile the study of public administration as a part of the science of government needs to be carried forward within the discipline of political science. (1968, p. 62)

Charlesworth takes a more defensive stance toward the possible

integration of administrative studies:

> It is well known that a number of business management professors hold that administration is administration, and that there is no valid reason for special applications of special administrative methods to schools, hospitals, armies, churches, factories, department stores, cities, government bureaus, legislative branches, and the like. Many of these professors are arrogant, and contend that administration which is administration is business administration, and that they are presently prepared to teach or train practitioners in all of the fields mentioned. . . . In governmental administration, as contrasted with business administration. . . . Nothing important is comparable. (1968, p. 333)

This point again raises the question of the common and the unique. But even beyond that question, resistance to the establishment of generic studies is forcefully demonstrated.

Considering the tendency to preserve disciplinary boundaries, it is not surprising to find that one of the early proponents of generic studies has had further thoughts on the issue. Walton has not abandoned the general concept, but recently he seems more impressed than he was earlier by the variations in administrative processes:

> Readers who are familiar with my earlier attempts to make some sense out of educational administration may make a surprised guess that I have had second thoughts about the notion that "administration is everywhere the same." It is true that I have had second thoughts, but they have not changed my original conception of the administrative phenomenon; at one level of abstraction it is possible to conceive of administration as the same activity in all organizations. . . . However, at another level of consideration, we may think of administration as varying with the purposes and substantive activities of organizations. (1970, p. 56)

Regrettably, Walton does not elaborate on the significance that focusing on these variations has for preparation programs.

Goldhammer recommends that preparation programs for educational administrators place increased emphasis on specialization. He states that the administrator "must be prepared for the different roles that he will be required to play in the performance of specific types of responsibilities in school organizations" (1968, p. 180). The views of Walton and Goldhammer and those of other scholars, such as Campbell (1958), may reflect a continuing concern for emphasizing the unique characteristics of educational administration.

The preservation of disciplinary boundaries militates against the development of generic programs and hinders communication among the disciplines. In general, scholars usually have debated the issue of training-in-common in public, business, or educational administration and not across these boundaries. Indeed, the trend seems to be toward a "hardening of the boundaries." This affliction is obviously not conducive to the further development of the science of administration.

ORGANIZATIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL BARRIERS

The final major problem involves organizational barriers and institutionalized practices that make it very difficult to introduce new preparatory programs. Events have borne out the general observation that planning new programs and developing new curricula are achieved more readily in new institutions than in established ones. The administrative programs that differ significantly from previous ones—Irvine, Sangamon, and Saskatchewan—were all developed at new institutions. Although other centers have also developed different programs, these tend to be modifications in practices rather than radically new departures. The costs and risks involved in program reorganization encourage program planners to adopt an incremental change strategy.

Institutionalized sources of resistance are numerous. The background preparation of professors, professional identifications, and instructional materials all contribute to the maintenance of present practices and the preservation of current disciplinary boundaries.

Furthermore, career patterns from one administrative specialization to another have not been clearly established nor become common enough to give the prospective administrator confidence in a fully integrated preparation program. In some specialized fields such as educational administration, the career path is still predominantly through the professional (teaching) specialty, at least initially, rather than through administrative expertise. So far both the administrators and the teachers appear to find this a more acceptable arrangement. This form of entrance in certain professionalized fields may prove to be another factor in the preservation of existing practices.

PROSPECTS

It is hazardous to project likely developments. There are no clear trends evident and there appears to be almost a standoff between the demonstrated or assumed merits of training-in-common and the barriers that hamper its development. The safest assumption is that new programs will continue to be introduced, existing ones will be broadened, and experimentation with various organizational arrangements will proceed. The pace of development will depend largely on the willingness of scholars and program planners to devote attention to analyzing and experimenting with training-in-common.

No doubt, scholars will continue to be interested in administration qua administration and the specialized fields of administration will become less insular. The most promising prospect for training-in-common seems to be the type of joint program that has been developed at Stanford University. Such special-purpose programs can make best use of the resources and knowledge in specialized fields while at the same time allowing the individual disciplines to maintain integrity.

Short of the joint program approach, some discussion among departments on a campus might lead to the definition of common or joint courses that could be pursued by students in more than one specialized area. Of course, new institutions will continue to have the advantage and should lead in the initiation and implementation of generic programs. Many new arrangements can be instituted if those who have responsibility for the preparation of administrators are willing.

More than willingness is required, however, if training-in-common is to be thoroughly explored and the pace of its implementation accelerated. Action is required in four problem areas.

First, the cross-institutional study of organizations and administration is receiving insufficient attention. Lack of progress in identifying the significant similarities and differences in the administrative processes and functions in different organizations hampers the development of generic approaches. This should be recognized as an area for increasing empirical research and theorizing, and for developing courses that will appeal to prospective administrators in various institutional areas.

Second, a search of the literature reveals far too little communication across existing disciplinary boundaries on practices and

desirable innovations in preparation programs. No doubt, much thought and analysis are given to the content of preparation programs. Unfortunately, the results of this analysis do not appear in the general literature and, if written, probably exist as materials intended only for inhouse use. Analysis of overall goals of preparation programs is particularly lacking. In educational administration, for example, continuing attention is given to the specifics of preparation and to training materials while the rationale underlying the preparation programs receives only sporadic attention.

Third, there is a surprising lack of empirical research on selecting candidates, improving instructional practices, influencing administrative behavior, and other aspects of administrator preparation. Again, there is no doubt that institutional research is being carried out and that programs are being modified in the light of this research. There are, however, few if any formally reported studies that could be used as bases for designing new programs. The absence of programmatic research and analysis on various aspects of preparing administrators is not only a source of embarrassment but also a major barrier to program improvement and innovation.

Finally, evaluation research is particularly important for those institutions now developing new programs or instructional practices. It is essential that these universities be sufficiently aware of the importance of their innovations and that they have the resources to carry out appropriate studies and to disseminate the resulting information.

Significant progress in these areas will greatly increase the probability that the future for generic studies is much brighter than some present indications suggest. New programs and continued debate, however, may be signs of a resurgence of interest in the study of administration qua administration in the various specialized fields.

More bold and innovative program planners, more scholars willing and ready to take the generic study of administration seriously, and more research and dialogue about the nature of administrative preparation programs are needed. Then, if training-in-common is rejected, at least it will not be by default but as a result of demonstrated undesirability.

5

Summary

For years, training-in-common and the generic study of administration have been subjects of speculation in various specialized fields. In the midfifties these ideas received particular attention in educational administration but the high level of interest did not persist. Most of the recent attention to and criticism of in-common preparation has come from other fields. Although the past few years have not produced many additional insights or research, some centers have taken seriously the concept that there are common administrative elements and that some form of training-in-common is not only feasible but desirable.

The recurring rationales for a generic approach to training are highly consistent. The usual point of departure is that there is a need to upgrade training programs to respond to changing administrative environments. The development of programs that are, at least in part, common for prospective administrators in two or more institutional areas is one way to meet this need. Besides upgrading training, the generic approach can also be seen as a means to develop

the science of administration. Present approaches to the study of administration leave it fragmented; consequently, generalizations that might be appropriate for more than one institutional area emerge very slowly.

A number of rationales for generic studies are based directly on changing circumstances in administration. One point of view is that no institutional area is free from interrelationships with others. Since administrators need to communicate and interact with one another in performing their functions, the question is raised whether a form of in-common training would meet this need.

Another rationale is that organizations in various institutional areas are no longer as dissimilar as they once were; clearly, there is a convergence of characteristics in all large-scale operations. This convergence nullifies some of the long-standing arguments for training in separate departments or schools.

A further point is that generic approaches offer a more realistic career preparation because in the future administrators will not restrict their careers to only one institutional area. Training-in-common also increases the more immediate career alternatives of the prospective administrator.

Strategies for achieving these objectives have also been proposed. They include arranging some form of joint course or joint program, broadening the definition of management studies, establishing centers for the study and development of administrative science, and creating a graduate school of administration committed both to developing administrative science and to emphasizing common elements in preparation programs.

A survey of ongoing practices resulted in the identification of centers that have adopted various forms of these strategies. Only one strategy is not presently implemented: no center has been devoted specifically to the study of administration since the Administrative Science Center at the University of Pittsburgh closed.

Several long-established schools of management indicated that their programs have a relevance beyond just management in the business areas. Examples were given of schools with combined programs in public and business administration and some form of core program, such as the one at Cornell. Only one joint program in business and educational administration (Stanford) was identified and described.

Three different types of integrated approaches to administrator

preparation were outlined. The Regina Campus of the University of Saskatchewan represents an approach to general administrative studies at the undergraduate level; Sangamon State University offers a special purpose form of common program; and the Graduate School of Administration on the Irvine Campus of the University of California is a prototype of a generic approach to the study of administration and the training of administrators.

Even limited experience with these strategies supports speculation about the major potential problems. Although some schools obviously have not been frightened by what others consider to be almost insurmountable difficulties, the problems are very real. Perhaps the major issue is the content and scope of administrative science. Although the concept of such a discipline is appealing, a precise definition of its substance is elusive. Consequently, the specialized areas of administration tend to focus inward, to concentrate on improving themselves, and to give low priority to the development of a generic administrative science.

Uncertainty about the significance of the common elements in administration continues. One viewpoint holds that the common characteristics tend to be trivial and insignificant, particularly as they relate to the work of administrators, and that what administrators really need to know tends to be specific to each type of organization and institution. Accordingly, what is common to more than one institutional area can be given recognition but need not and should not form the basis of training programs.

Various institutionalized practices also serve to retard developments in generic approaches to administrative preparation.

Prospects for the further development of training-in-common are somewhat uncertain. The rate of progress depends on the extent to which additional knowledge is gained. This rate would probably increase if more scholars were to take on the cross-institutional study of administration, if there were increased communication about preparation programs (particularly across institutional boundaries), if there were more research on administrative preparation programs, and if information and research on the innovative programs now in operation were adequately disseminated. It is essential that this need for knowledge receive attention from individual scholars, institutions, and professional associations of administrators.

Bibliography

Bolstad, W.G. "A New Approach to Administrative Studies at the Undergraduate Level." Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Schools of Business in Calgary, Alberta, 1968.

Boulding, Kenneth E. "Evidences for an Administrative Science: A Review of the *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Volumes 1 and 2." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 3, 1 (June 1958), 1-22.

Boyan, Norman J. "Common and Specialized Learnings for Administrators and Supervisors: Some Problems and Issues." In *Preparation Programs for School Administrators*, edited by Donald J. Leu and Herbert C. Rudman. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1963, 1-23.

Caldwell, Lynton K. "Methodology in the Theory of Public Administration." In *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives and Method*, edited by James C. Charlesworth. Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968, 205-222.

Campbell, Roald F. "What Peculiarities in Educational Administration Make It a Special Case?" In *Administrative Theory in Education*, edited by Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958, 166-185.

Carnegie-Mellon University. *Graduate School of Administration: Masters and Doctoral Programs 1972-73*. Pittsburgh: Carnegie-Mellon University, 1971.

Charlesworth, James C. "A Report and Also Some Projections, Relating to the Present Dimensions and Directions of the Discipline of Public Administration." In *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope,*

Objectives, and Methods, edited by James C. Charlesworth. Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968, 322-336.

Cornell University Announcements. *Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, 1971-72.* Ithaca: Cornell University, 1971.

Crozier, Michel. "The Present Convergence of Public Administration and Large Private Enterprises, and its Consequences." *International Social Science Journal*, 20, 1 (1968), 7-16.

Culbertson, Jack A. "Common and Specialized Content in the Preparation of Administrators." In *Preparation Programs for School Administrators*, edited by Donald J. Leu and Herbert C. Rudman. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1963, 34-60.

———. "Trends and Issues in the Development of a Science of Administration." In *Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences* by W.W. Charters, Jr. and others. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1965, 3-22.

———. "Preparation of Special and General Educational Administrators." In *Common and Specialized Learning Competencies and Experiences for Special Education Administrators*, Proceedings of the National Conference, edited by Charles Meisgeier and Robert Sloat. Austin: The University of Texas, 1969, 72-83.

Culbertson, Jack A., and Hencley, Stephen P., eds. *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives.* Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

Goldhammer, Keith. "Implications for Change in Training Programs." In *Knowledge Production and Utilization in Educational Administration*, edited by Terry L. Eidell and Joanne M. Kitchell. Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1968, 174-184.

Gordon, Paul J. "Administrative Strategy for a Graduate School of Administration." *Academy of Management Journal*, 10, 4 (December 1967), 351-364.

Gordon, Robert A., and Howell, James E. *Higher Education for Business.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Griffiths, Daniel E. *Administrative Theory.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Henderson, Keith M. *Emerging Synthesis in American Public Administration.* New York: Asia Publishing House, 1966.

Hilling, Helen C. "Public Administration: Study, Practice, Profession." *Public Administration Review*, 26, 4 (December 1966), 320-328.

Hinderaker, Ivan. "The Study of Administration: Interdisciplinary Dimensions." *The Western Political Quarterly*, 16, 3 (September 1963), 5-12.

Kirst, Michael W. "Stanford Joint Program in Educational Administration." Mimeographed. Also *UCEA Newsletter*, 11, 4 (April 1970).

Knezevich, S. J. "Professional Birth Control," in "They Said This: Abstracts of Recent Addresses." *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 18, 1 (Spring 1967), 91-103.

LeBreton, Preston P. "The New Challenge and Opportunity for the Management Scholar." In *Research Toward the Development of Management Thought.* Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, 1967.

Leu, Donald J., and Rudman, Herbert C., eds. *Preparation Programs for School Administrators: Common and Specialized Learnings.* East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1963.

Litchfield, Edward H. "Notes on a General Theory of Administration." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1, 1 (June 1956), 3-29.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology. *The Master's Program and The Doctoral Program, Alfred P. Sloan School of Management.* Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1971.

Mayntz, Renate. "The Study of Organizations." *Current Sociology*, 13, 3 (1964), 93-155.

McNulty, Nancy G. *Training Managers: The International Guide.* New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Parsons, Talcott. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1, 1 (June 1956), 63-85, and 1, 2 (September 1956), 225-239.

Ridley, F. F. "Public Administration or Administrative Science." *Political Studies*, 16, 3 (October 1968), 441-445.

Riggs, Fred W. "Professionalism, Political Science, and the Scope of Public Administration." In *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods*, edited by James C. Charlesworth. Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968, 32-62.

Sangamon State University. "Proposal for a New Unit of Instruction: Master of Arts Degree in Administration." Mimeographed. Springfield, Illinois: Sangamon State University, 1971.

Short, Lloyd M. "Strengthening Education for Public Administration." *Public Administration Review*, 26, 1 (March 1966), 1-2.

Snyder, Richard C. "The Preparation of Educational Administrators: Some Problems Reconsidered in the Context of the Establishment of a New Graduate School of Administration." In *Educational Administration: International Perspectives*, edited by George Baron, Dan H. Cooper, and

William G. Walker. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1969, 269-299.

Stanford University. "The Joint Program in Educational Administration: Graduate School of Business–School of Education." Mimeographed. Stanford, California: 1970.

———. *Graduate School of Business Catalogue 1971-72.* Stanford, California: Stanford University, 1971.

Thompson, James D. "On Building an Administrative Science." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 7, 1 (June 1956), 102-111.

———. Communication dated September 14, 1971.

Thompson, James D., and others, eds. *Comparative Studies in Administration.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1959.

University of California. *Graduate School of Administration.* Irvine, California: University of California, 1970. Also "Description of Core Courses in M.S. Program," and "M.S. Program," Graduate School of Administration. Mimeographed, Fall 1971.

University of Saskatchewan. *Administration Calendar 1971-72.* Regina: University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus, 1971.

Waldo, Dwight. "Scope of the Theory of Public Administration." In *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods,* edited by James C. Charlesworth. Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968, 1-26.

Walton, John. *Administration and Policy-Making in Education.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959.

———. "The Education of Educational Administrators." In *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives,* edited by Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962, 89-101.

———. "The Dissimilarity of Educational Administration." *Public Administration Review,* 30, 1 (January-February 1970), 56-59.

Wegner, Robert E.C. "Business Schools–The Response That Failed and A New Alternative." Paper presented at the Northwest Universities Business Administration Conference in Calgary, Alberta on October 24, 1970.

———. "The Faculty of Administration: Its Program and Progress." Unpublished paper, University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus, dated October 24, 1970.

Wengert, E.S., and others. *The Study of Administration.* Eugene: University of Oregon, 1961.

Wynn, Richard. Communication dated September 9, 1971.

Yale University. *Administrative Sciences.* New Haven, Connecticut: Department of Administrative Sciences, Yale University, 1971.

Yoon, B. Man. "Management Discipline in a School of Administration: A Reappraisal in the Public Service Perspective." *Academy of Management Journal,* 11, 3 (September 1968), 279-289.

York University. *Faculty of Administrative Studies, Calendar 1971-72.* Downsview, Ontario: York University, 1971.